



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

xiii, 5 (p. 27). I refer again to Hoffmann's article, which offers for the passages in question a translation and explanation correct save for a few minor details (*ibid.*, pp. 59 *sq.*). I need only mention here that everything in the passages in question goes to support Hoffmann's explanation (pp. 56 *sqq.*) of מַלְבָּן שֶׁל מִטָּה or שֶׁל עֵרִיסָה (Krengel's inference, that in the second passage only the עֵרִיסָה is spoken of, is incorrect) as the two short and two long pieces of the bed-frame joined to form a rectangle. It must be noticed, also, that the sources from which Krengel has drawn in regard to the massive tables, etc., of gold are, without exception, humorous religious anecdotes, characterized throughout by the most extreme exaggeration. (In regard to the golden table in the temple, p. 2, note 5, *cf.* Exod. 25:23 *sq.*, etc.) I shall only mention further that the author understood חֶמֶת מִיָּין (Hos. 7:5) to mean leather-bag [filled] with wine (p. 47, note 5). M. BUTTENWIESER.

HEBREW UNION COLLEGE,
Cincinnati, O.

WRIGHT'S ARABIC GRAMMAR.¹

It must be confessed that this book is a great disappointment. I do not mean that it is not a good and useful book—a simple reprint of the second edition would have been that, and much more this enlarged and corrected third edition—but the pity is that it is not a great deal better and more useful. We had waited long for “the new edition of Wright,” as we called it fondly, but the new edition which we looked for was something different from this. It was well known that Wright was preparing for a revision on an extensive plan and had collected much material from Sibawayhi and other sources. If he had lived, there can be little doubt that we would have had almost a new work, just as the first edition was completely transformed in passing into the second. In that revision the first volume gained almost one hundred pages and the second more than one hundred and fifty. In this edition each volume has lost more than thirty pages, against which, however, must be reckoned greater compression in printing and space gained by suppressing the sections on comparative Semitic.

But even in its second edition the book was not abreast of what might have been expected of a scholar like Wright and demanded in a grammar that was to be the constant companion of all the Arabists of Europe. I cannot express those requirements better than by quoting some passages from August Müller's review of the second edition in the *ZDMG.*, Vol. XXX, pp. 200–216: “Die längst anerkannte Vorzüge von Caspari's Arbeit noch einmal hervorzuheben darf ich unterlassen; einer

¹ A GRAMMAR OF THE ARABIC LANGUAGE. Translated from the German of Caspari, and edited, with numerous additions and corrections, by W. Wright, LL.D., late Professor of Arabic in the University of Cambridge. Third edition, revised by W. Robertson Smith, late Professor of Arabic in the University of Cambridge, and M. J. de Goeje, Professor of Arabic in the University of Leyden. Cambridge: *At the University Press*, 1896 (and Vol. II, 1898). xiv + 317 and xx + 450 pp.

der grössten Fehler derselben scheint mir die Systemlosigkeit der Elementar- und Formenlehre, und, was damit zusammenhängt, der gänzliche Mangel einer Lautlehre, zu sein. Ich bezweifle keinen Augenblick, dass Wright, hätte er nicht gewissermassen an die ursprüngliche Anordnung des Stoffes sich gebunden gefühlt, zum Vortheile des Lesers die Sache ganz anders angegriffen hätte. Jetzt erscheinen als rein äusserlich durch die Grenzen der einzelnen grammatischen Abschnitte zusammengehalten Haufen von Einzelheiten, welche auch nur durch fortgesetzte Verweisungen mit einander zu verknüpfen fast unmöglich, ausserdem aber unzureichend ist." After a number of examples of this, August Müller continues: "Ein anderer Mangel von Caspari's Arbeit ist der, dass in Folge der oft zu äusserlichen Anordnung des Stoffes manche Punkte, die in seinem Schema keine selbständige Stelle erhielten, entweder in beiläufige, oft zu sparsame Erwähnungen zersplittert wurden und dabei gelegentlich an Orte gerieten, wo man sie nicht sucht, oder ganz und gar wegblieben. Grade hier leidet das neue Werk gelegentlich durch den engen Anschluss an seinen Vorgänger, von welchem es sich sonst so glücklich entfernt." Examples again follow, and then he goes on: "In der That wäre sie [his above-expressed wishes] mit einer gänzlichen Umarbeitung des Buches in Bezug auf Anordnung und vielfach auch Darstellung des Materials gleichbedeutend; trotzdem kann ich nicht umhin ihm für diesen erwünschten Fall zwei weitere Bitten vorzutragen, weil sie mir beide als Consequenzen des von ihm selbst gewollten erscheinen." The first of these requests is that there should be prefixed to the grammar a short introduction dealing with the position of Arabic among the other Semitic languages, its history and its dialects, and how it has borne itself toward foreign influences and been affected by them. The second request is that more attention should be paid to the later, post-classical, forms and usages.

Such are the requirements which August Müller expressed more than twenty years ago; they are the requirements which were before the present editors. No one can doubt their justice. How have they been met? The arrangement of the book remains absolutely the same as Wright left it. A phonology is still conspicuous by its absence. Wright's method of handling phonetic questions is practically untouched, though some of the particular passages criticised by Müller have been slightly changed. In general, this, the weakest side of the grammar, is unaltered. An attempt has been made to obviate the lack of system by the introduction of numerous cross-references and the extension of the indexes. The sections on comparative Semitic are almost all cut away, and in their place are references to Wright's *Comparative Grammar*, which is certainly his weakest book; this is one way of meeting Müller's petition for a more scientific treatment of this subject and for a general introduction to it. To Müller's second request no further attention, so far as I have noticed, has been paid.

At this point the question may pertinently come up of the exact place which this grammar is intended to fill. We can have a grammar that is

purely introductory — meant for the beginner — to be abandoned after a certain stage has been passed. In this class come Socin's golden little book and Harder's *Konversations-Grammatik*. Then come the grammars which are not introductory, but are permanent books of reference. Here there are several sub-classes. We have books of moderate compass, not professing absolute completeness, which have grown up often out of books of our first class. Such, for example, is Caspari-Müller. At the opposite extreme to these are books which aim at the explanatory reproduction of the views of the native grammarians. Such are Jahn's annotated translation of Sibawayhī and Howell's gigantic application to grammar of Lane's lexicographical method. Last there comes the class of *thesauri*, attempts at covering the whole ground with more or less completeness. An early and important place is taken here by the unfinished work of Lumsden; later come the grammars of Ewald and Kosegarten; but the crowning place is easily taken by the *Grammaire arabe* of de Sacy, with the running commentary of Fleischer. That Wright's grammar stands in this sub-class of *thesauri* can hardly be denied. It had been our hope that the new edition would make it the leading book in the class and render us independent of the others; that in it the fullness of de Sacy-Fleischer would be combined with an order foreign to both, with a recognition of the forms and usages of mediæval Arabic, on which they would have looked down, but which we find to be essential, and with a scientific treatment of the phonology of the language which was impossible in their time. Such an undertaking would have been worthy of the Press of the University of Cambridge and of the great scholars whose names stand on this title-page; but the hope has been disappointed, and that is all that can be said about it. The blame it is impossible to place. It may have been the publishers; it may have been the editors. This, at least, it is but fair to say: when the editorial charge passed into the hands of Professor de Goeje, fifty-six pages had been printed, and the revision had extended over thirty pages more. He, not unnaturally, felt himself compelled to follow in the footsteps of his predecessor. The fame of the great Leyden Arabist cannot suffer through this book, but it would have been better for Arabic letters if he had insisted on the work being begun anew from the beginning.

I come now to details, and, as might be expected, what I have to set forth is not so much sins of commission as sins of omission and oversight. Professor de Goeje is one of the first three or four Arabists in Europe, and, if I may be excused the slang, what he says goes. In Vol. II, p. 180C, the statement, "But if both are substantives, this is not usually done," is too strong. Compare Nöldeke, *Zur Grammatik*, § 48, and the quotation there from al-Khafājī. Similarly, the expression, Vol. II, p. 59B, "The second is not uncommon," is somewhat unguarded in view of Nöldeke's "äusserst selten" in *Zur Grammatik*, § 61a. One most curious omission is the lack of all reference to Nöldeke's discovery of *waw conversive* in Arabic, *Zur Grammatik*, p. 68; at least I have been unable to find any mention of it. In II, 176D, the translation should be

“like lance-thrusts” or “like lance-thrusting.” The footnote to II, 114, is too brief, and should have an exact reference. In I, 11A, it would have been much better if, instead of simply expunging the sentence to which Nöldeke objected, his remarks had been incorporated from *ZDMG.*, Vol. XXX, p. 207; the usage which could lead Wright astray surely deserved some notice. In the *Addenda* to I, 115, footnote, there should have been a reference to Nöldeke, *Zur Grammatik*, p. 18. In I, 286B, the notice of فقط is very inadequate; nor do I find it further dealt with in the Syntax. In II, 149C, the technical term للاختصاص should be rather translated “to show that one is specially characterized or distinguished by a thing or by the possession of a thing.” Further, the technical terms ال للاستغراق and لا لاستغراق الجنس might have been added with advantage. The term اسم مصدر occurs in the index, but I can find no definition of it, and its nature can only be vaguely gathered from two or three references; yet those words form a very interesting class. Many of the references are perplexing and annoying. An omission that is purely amusing is the dropping out of Wright’s dedication to Fleischer, while the paragraph in the preface speaking of that dedication is carefully reprinted. But are we to gather from the exact references by volume and page to the *Fā’iq* of az-Zamakhsharī that we may look for an edition of it soon? That would be a cause of rejoicing. It is to be presumed that the references to a glossary to aṭ-Ṭabarī are to be interpreted in the same way. But it may be doubted whether in a grammar it is right to refer the student for the explanation of a point, or even for further details on a point, to some other book; references *from* books of reference are not satisfying, and there are many here which should have been quotations. A point I would gladly have seen dealt with is the nature in Arabic, and in Semitic generally, of the *waṣf* or *na’t*. It is true that no grammar, to my knowledge, except Lumsden’s, touches upon it, but it is none the less a vital point in the language, as Lumsden has shown, and a source of great obscurity to the student till simple experience makes the facts clear to him. In this grammar the only suggestion of the truth is *descriptive epithet* on p. 105A; but as that follows immediately upon the misleading term *nomen adjectivum*, the gain is not great. To return to the recognition, or rather non-recognition, of post-classical usages, it would have been greatly to the advantage of the grammar if more account had been taken of August Müller’s *Ueber Text und Sprachgebrauch von Ibn Abi Uṣeibi’ a’s Geschichte der Aerzte in the Sitzungsberichte der philos.-philol. u. histor. Classe der k. bayer. Akad. der Wiss.*, 1884, Heft V. In some respects these notes apply also to classical usage, as that on the introduction of the *ḥabar* by *fa*, p. 922 of Müller; compare, too, the quotations in that passage and Lane, p. 2323a. Similarly, I have found nothing to explain the *fa* in Qur’ān, LXXIV, 3 (Müller in *ZDMG.*, Vol. XXX, p. 204), and the ellipsis of conjunctions is not adequately noticed in II, 288 (Müller, *Ueber Text*, p. 900, and especially footnote on the possibility of the second perfect being a

hāl). In general, the use of both *wa* and *fa* calls for much fuller treatment; in later Arabic such phrases as *وَعَلَىٰ هَذَا ف* and *هَذَا وَ* are very frequent. Similarly, the use of the expressions *نَعَمْ* *أَنْ* and *نَعَمْ لَوْ* by way of *اِسْتِدْرَاك*, *it is true*, might have been explained. Further, the frequent omission in later Arabic of *min* in the phrase *لَا يَدَّ مِنْ* is not recognized (Müller, p. 903); II, 26D, on the omission of *'an* is hardly adequate (Müller, p. 902); II, 302, could be expanded, following Müller, p. 918; and II, 225, could be expanded and corrected by Müller, p. 920.

But if we can overcome our disappointment and take this book on its own terms as a simple reprint of the second edition, with some expansions and corrections, we must receive it with gratitude as an excellent piece of work. The external form is well-nigh perfect, as is also the proof-reading; the Arabic type is from the beautiful and clear font cut for Lane's use in his dictionary; there are sixty pages of excellent indexes, though the third might be fuller; finally, Professor de Goeje has put all Arabists deep in his debt by his additions and corrections. But would that those responsible had taken a larger view of their duty!

DUNCAN B. MACDONALD

NEW HARBOR, MAINE.